

REMARKS

The above application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed August 31, 2007. Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 15 have been amended above. Claims 4, 7, 13, 14, 17, and 20 have been canceled above without prejudice or disclaimer, and without acquiescence to the basis for the rejection. Claims 21-24 have been added above. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-12, 15-16, 18-19, and 21-24 are now pending in this application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and favorable action on remaining claims in view of these amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 have been substantially amended. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to more clearly describe the increased depth of the channels for enhanced resistance to a blast force. Support for the amendments can be found at least in the Figs. and on p. 8, line 9 of ¶ 23. Claim 8 has been substantially amended to more clearly describe the U-shaped channels facing in opposite directions. Support for the amendments can be found at least in Fig. 3, wherein the base members are shown by reference numeral 300B.

Independent claim 24 has been added to more clearly describe the mullion as shown at least in Figs. 3, 4, and 5. Referring specifically to Figure 3, the mullion 302 has a first side (right facing side, as shown) and a second side (the left facing side, as shown). The generally U-shaped channel of the first side is composed of 300A, 300B, and 300C. The L-shaped channel of the second side is composed of 300A and 300B. The bonding leg of the interlocking member is shown as 300C. As can be seen from the Figure, the interlocking member mates with the second side of the mullion to form a generally U-shaped. Similarly in Fig. 4, the tongue-and-groove mating of the interlocking member and the second side can be seen.

Objections

The Abstract has been objected to for containing improper content. The abstract has been amended to remove the improper content. Applicant respectfully submits that the abstract is now in condition for allowance.

Rejections

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,581,342 to Tavivian ("Tavivian"). Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not show each and every element of the claims as being disclosed in Tavivian. However, to further prosecution, Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly claim the invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the structure of independent claim 1, as amended, is not disclosed, taught or suggested in Tavivian. Amended claim 1 requires, in a curtain wall system, a mullion with a first channel of an increased depth for receiving an increased portion of a panel member. The first channel has first and second arms that contact the two sides of the panel member. The first arm has a gasket running its entire length for applying pressure to one side of the panel member. The second arm is adapted to receive a bonding agent to seal the other side of the panel member. Adapting the second arm in such a way to be able to create a seal of bonding agent that is one inch or more thick is not disclosed in Tavivian and provides substantial benefits over prior art systems. As disclosed in the subject specification, such a device provides a means to provide structural integrity to a curtain wall system sufficient to withstand high wind, impact, or other outside forces. *See* subject specification ¶ 23 - ¶ 31. Tavivian fails to disclose at least the above mentioned limitations of amended claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is novel over Tavivian and Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of amended claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3 and 5-6 depend from, and further restrict, independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for the reasons set forth with respect to amended claim 1, claims 2-3 and 5-6 are novel over Tavivian. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 2-3 and 5-6 be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8, as amended, is not disclosed in Tavivian. Amended claim 8 requires, among other things, a first channel for receiving a first panel member and a second channel for receiving a second panel member wherein the bases of the two channels are substantially coplanar. Adapting the channels in this way allows panel members to be secured therein and the edges of the two panel members to be close to each other. Tavivian fails to disclose at least these limitations of amended claim 8. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least this reason, amended claim 8 is novel over Tavivian and Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of amended claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claims 9-12 depend from, and further restrict, independent claim 8 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for the reasons set forth with respect to amended claim 8, claims 9-12 are novel over Tavivian. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 9-12 be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15, as amended, is not disclosed in Tavivian. Amended claim 15 requires, among other things, in a horizontal mullion for forming a curtain wall a channel of an increased depth for receiving an increased portion of a panel member. The channel has first and second side members that contact the two sides of the panel member. The first side member is adapted to receive a bonding agent to seal the other side of the panel member. The second side member has a gasket running its entire length for applying pressure to one side of the panel member. Adapting the first side member in such a way to be able to create a seal of bonding agent that is one inch or more thick is not disclosed in Tavivian and provides substantial benefits over prior art systems. Tavivian fails to disclose at least these limitations of amended claim 15. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least this reason, amended claim 15 is novel over Tavivian and Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of amended claim 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 17-19 depend from, and further restrict, independent claim 15 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for the reasons set forth with respect to

amended claim 15, claims 16-19 are novel over Tavivian. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 16 and 17-19 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Dated: December 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Jeffrey A. Tinker/
Jeffrey A. Tinker
Registration No.: 58,807
WINSTEAD PC
P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 745-5400
Attorneys For Applicant